## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

|                    | § |                             |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| DIANNE LEE WEAVER, | § |                             |
|                    | § |                             |
| Petitioner,        | § |                             |
|                    | § |                             |
| v.                 | § | Case No. 6:25-cv-36-JDK-KNM |
|                    | § |                             |
| KEVIN WHITE,       | § |                             |
|                    | § |                             |
| Respondent.        | § |                             |
|                    | § |                             |

## ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Petitioner Dianne Lee Weaver, proceeding pro se, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus and paid the filing fee. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

On February 5, 2025, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court dismiss the petition for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Docket No. 4. A copy of this Report was mailed to Petitioner at the address she provided on her petition, but she has not objected to the Report.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc),

superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to

file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Petitioner did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore

reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and

reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See

United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no

objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly

erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case,

the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to

law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the

United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 4) as the findings of this Court. This

case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. All

pending motions are **DENIED** as moot.

So ordered and signed on this

Mar 8, 2025

JER MY D KERNODLE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2